

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY
(Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference PHDE030027WO	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/IB2004/000101	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 12 January 2004 (12.01.2004)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 22 January 2003 (22.01.2003)]
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC		
7 B60C 23/04		
Applicant PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS GMBH		

1. This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a).
 2. This REPORT consists of a total of 6 sheets, including this cover sheet.

In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.

3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I | Basis of the report |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II | Priority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

4. The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis .2).

	Date of issuance of this report 22 July 2005 (22.07.2005)
The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland	Authorized officer Idhir Britel
Facsimile No. +41 22 740 14 35	Telephone No. +41 22 338 70 60

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

REC'D 24 MAY 2004

WIPO

PCT

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220	FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below	
International application No. PCT/B2004/000101	International filing date (day/month/year) 12.01.2004	Priority date (day/month/year) 22.01.2003
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC B60C23/04		
Applicant PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS...		

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- Box No. II Priority
- Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:  European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465	Authorized Officer Billen, K Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7020
--	---



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IB2004/000101

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 - This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - a sequence listing
 - table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - in written format
 - in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - contained in the international application as filed.
 - filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/B2004/000101

Box No. II Priority

1. The following document has not been furnished:

- copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).
 translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3. Additional observations, if necessary:

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	1-10
	No: Claims	
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-10
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-10
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

Reference is made to the following documents:

- D1: WO 00/15931 A
- D2: DE 199 53 488 C (CONTINENTAL AG) 10 May 2001 (2001-05-10)
- D3: EP-A-1 150 849 (EMTOP LTD) 7 November 2001 (2001-11-07)
- D4: GB-A-2 122 757 (LABINAL) 18 January 1984

V.1 Independent Claim 1

The application does not meet the requirements of the PCT because the subject-matter of claim 1 does not involve an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT).

As mentioned in the application D1 discloses the preamble of claim 1.

The subject-matter of claim 1 differs from that of D1 in that the carrier station 60 is designed as in each case at least one sensor unit, which is assigned to at least one wheel or tire 90 of a progressive movement means and which is designed to detect or determine at least one characteristic parameter of the wheel or tire, such as for example the air pressure of the wheel or tire.

The object underlying said difference is to adapt a capacitive coupling circuit for wireless data transmission to a tire pressure monitoring system.

A similar carrier station (4), comprising a tire pressure sensor (32) and being capacitively coupled with electrode (8) of a base station 6 is described in document D2 as providing the same advantages as in the present application. The skilled person would therefore regard it as a normal design option to include this feature in the electronic communication system described in document D1 in order to solve the problem posed.

The subject-matter of claim 1 does therefore not involve an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT).

V.2 Dependent Claims

The dependent claims 2-10 do not appear to contain any additional features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT with respect to inventive step (Articles 33(3) PCT).

These claims suggest a slight constructional change in the design of the electronic communication system which - considering the disclosure of D1-D4 - comes within the scope of the customary practice followed by persons skilled in the art, especially as the advantages thus achieved can be readily contemplated in advance. Consequently, the subject-matter of the dependent claims also appears to lack of inventive step.

V.3 Industrial Applicability

The subject-matter of claims 1 to 10 seems to fulfil the requirement of Article 33(4) PCT since it can be used at least in the automotive industry.